DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 296 EA 021 971

AUTHOR Waite, Duncan
TITLE Instructional Supervisor as Cultural Guide.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anthropology; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnography; Social Influences; *Socialization; Student Teacher Supervisors; *Supervision; *Supervisors; Supervisory Methods; Supervisory Training; Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

An ethnographic or anthropological perspective is useful for the reexamination of the assumptions and taken-for-granted nature of the practice of supervision. An indepth survey of literature on supervisors illustrates supervisory roles and the existence of a separate "supervisor culture". Specifically, the relationship between novice teachers and supervisors is viewed as an interactive socialization process. Application of an ethnographic viewpoint aids in understanding the supervisory enculturation process and shows how underlying cultural aspects of thought and behavior affect the practice of supervision. (26 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED320296

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISOR AS CULTURAL GUIDE

by Duncan Waite
University of Oregon
Draft of March 2, 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Duncan Waite

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts, April 16, 1990.

EA021971

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Like teaching itself, instructional supervision lacks an agreed upon definition.[1] The most common and least controversial definition is the "improvement of instruction" (Weller, 1971:5).[2] However, since there is no agreed upon definition of "instruction" this isn't of much help. Weller identified three functions of the supervisor: the counseling function, the teaching function, and the training function (pp. 7-15). In this paper, I suggest that an anthropologically-informed examination of supervisors and supervision would reveal other functions as well.

There is a need for such a qualitative understanding of supervision. This view was recently espoused by Pajak and Glickman (1989) when they called for ethnographic study of supervision:

> Ethnographic studies of teacher-supervisor interactions in actual school settings would be very enlightening. . . Both supervisory practice and subsequent research ought to be guided and tempered by perspectives that take personal meanings and social contexts into account (p.103).

An ethnographic or anthropological perspective should aid in a re-examination of the assumptions and taken-for-granted nature of the practice of supervision. The advantages of an ethnographic view of supervision can well be imagined: such a view should encourage supervisors to examine their own practices in light of this qualitative understanding and this may result in more "reflective practitioners"; such study may establish a definition of supervision and will almost certainly validate the numerous roles supervisors play in the professional lives of

teachers; there should be something in such a study which could inform change efforts targeting the practice of supervisors and their formal education.

What is the evidence that there are cultural[3] aspects to supervision? Basically, the evidence for a cultural dimension to supervision can be found reflected in actual practice and peppered throughout the literature.

CULTURAL REFERENCES IN THE SUPERVISION LITERATURE

Some authors acknowledge the "contexts of supervision" (Acheson and Gall, 1987). Sergiovanni (1985:11-12) writes of "Landscapes, Mindscapes, and Reflective Practice in Supervision":

> . . . the task of the supervisor is to make sense of messy situations by increasing understanding and discovering and communicating meaning. . . . Since supervisory messes are context bound and situationally determined. . . .[4]

Other authors examine the effects of colleges of education ---with their pre-service supervision components--- and cooperating teachers on the socialization of student teachers (Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1981; Tabachnick, Popkewitz and Zeichner, 1979-80). Lamenting the lack of a critical orientation among the supervisors they studied, Tabachnick, Popkewitz and Zeichner note (p.22):

> Contrary to popular belief, the university and schools were not in competition with each other for the hearts and minds of students; instead they collaborated closely with one another to create a powerful conservative force for defending existing institutional arrangements from close scrutiny and challenge. The language of the university in seminars and supervisory conferences failed to penetrate the taken-for-granted world of the school

> and subtly encouraged acquiesence and conformity to existing school routines.

Zeichner et al. (1988) discuss the "'traditional-craft' orientation" (p.351) to the relationship between student teachers and their university supervisor and cooperating teacher. They find:

> The master-apprentice relationship is generally seen as the vehicle for transmitting this cultural knowledge. In this program both the cooperating teacher and the supervisor are construed as potential masters and the elementary student teacher as the student (emphasis added).

Alfonso (1986) writes of school culture as an "unseen supervisor" acting to restrain change efforts. Alfonso's treatment appears to be more concerned with the district supervisor than the university supervisor ---the latter being the subject of the present paper--- though both are mentioned. The combination of these two, arguably distinct, roles creates some confusion and lessens the impact of his criticism. For, as I will argue, the university supervisor has a much greater impact on the student teacher's orientation to the cultures of teaching than the district supervisor may have in relation to that of the established teacher.

Alfonso is critical of the role supervisors perform in schools: "Evidence is sorely lacking that supervisors really make a difference" (p.2). The difference the author speaks of is that of changing "the culture of the school" (p. 20). I wish to draw a distinction between my views and those of Alfonso: Alfonso assumes the supervisor's role to be that of change-agent within the organizational structure; in this paper I argue that an

essential role of the supervisor is that of guiding students in the process of becoming teachers by orienting them to school- and teacher-culture.[5]

An unpublished doctoral dissertation by Migra (1976), titled The Transition from Theory into Practice: A Microethnography of Student Teaching as a Cultural Experience, bridges the gap between theory and practice in an examination of the paths student teachers take in becoming teachers. Though its focus seems to be the student teacher-cooperating teacher relationship, it also offers a rare glimpse into the role played by the university supervisor.[6] Migra notes:

> Where the students sought immediate feedback and constructive criticism, the teachers were willing to give it with the condition that it be accepted on their terms. These terms were that the student not be defensive and the advice be followed. The difficulty stemmed from the fact that the cooperating teachers seldom communicated these terms of the relationship. The student teachers were left to guess this expected behavior. As a result, both participants in this communication gap sought out the university supervisor and expected her to mediate the situation (p.77).

Hence, the university supervisor's role was seen as a facilitator: "Student teachers complained to the university supervisor that they didn't know what the cooperating teachers wanted" (p.79). The university supervisor was oriented to viewing student teachers as professionals: "Some students experienced difficulty because they were encouraged by the university supervisor to think of themselves as professionals, while the reality demanded that they 'know their place'" (p. 91).

Other aspects of the university supervisor's role were made

clear: "The university supervisor played a liaison role acting as advisor to both students and teachers with regard to appropriateness of classroom activities and matters of sequence and timing" (p.97); and "[w]here the communication concerned professional growth in social, emotional, and technical areas, the primary contact was between the student teacher and the university supervisor." Migra observed that it was the university supervisor and not the cooperating teacher who took the time and assumed the responsibility of dealing with the student teachers' "questions, value conflicts, and needs" (p. 97). She found that, due to expectations and prior experiences, this was what cooperating teachers and student teachers assumed the university supervisor's role entailed. She also noted that:

> It appears that the university supervisor assumed a facilitation role because neither cooperating teacher or student teacher clearly stated expectations or clarified value positions to the other. This seemed to be an expected part of the role of supervisor. The 'messenger' role of the supervisor was also part of role behavior expected by principal and other staff members since the supervisor was designated 'responsible' for the student teachers (p.98).

These, then, are the pieces to be found in the literature which touch upon the role of the university supervisor. What of practice?

VOICES FROM THE FIELD

Several of the previous works relied, at least partially, upon studies of supervisor-student teacher interaction. In augmenting these works in defense of my position, I wish to draw

upon discussions I held with four experienced supervisors charged with aiding intern teachers' transition from the university into teaching. Each of these supervisors holds both a university and a district title.

Faye ---an old hand with over fifteen years experience in this particular program--- describes her role in these terms:

> I feel in my supervisory capacity I do a lot of "mothering" to get started. I think that's what it would be called.
>
> In fact, I balk at the word "supervisor." Because it's like somebody's super and somebody else isn't. No, I'm not the ordinary supervisor. . . . So it's really difficult for me to see myself as a supervisor; either as a mirror or as a superordinate kind of thing. . . . I feel more comfortable with the word "coordinator."
>
> So I guess I do "mothering." I do supply-giving. I do all of that band-aid stuff because I think it's the first step. If you don't have a crutch, you get one. So I do it and people call me "mother hen" . . . . Somebody said something about my mothering her. I do less than I did. I do less emotional support on her than I did because she's getting stronger. I know it's not where I want to be. It is what I do. It's my job, to help her keep functioning: if she needs more pats on the pooh-pooh to keep going, that she's doing a good job. And I'll give them to her until she can begin to see her own way. She won't need them anymore.
>
> I feel like it's a kind of relationship kind of role --- something like it is with the teacher and the kids--- in that I would like to be their friend but it's not critical to their role in life that we be. I try.
>
> They want to use us as a safety measure or as a protective device and I think they should be able to. I think they want to be able to say, "Well, I can't do this because Faye says-," or, "If I did that Faye would be really upset." I think they want to be able to do that and if they need it, it's okay with me. If we're their best buddy I don't think they can use us in that way with their principals or with other teachers. They sometimes need it for their own defense.

Another supervisor with the program, Vern, talked about his interaction with some of his more "ideal" intern teachers:

> . . . rather than being [supervisor]/student, it became two colleagues ---one of whom sat in the back of the classroom with that extra set of eyes and gave them feedback, which they could accept or reject.

He spoke of the problem of rapport and of negotiating rights to enter and observe an intern teacher's class:

> I'd like to feel that I was trusted enough that I could just wander in and out.
>
> One of the things that taught me was the importance of establishing a working relationship and trust so if the teacher doesn't know you, you don't come in with your guns blazing right away. Instead you try to find good things and you establish a feeling of trust, even though that's never completely possible if you're a stranger.

He spoke of the qualities an ideal supervisor should possess:

> I think that having a developmental sense of the candidate is important. I think just being willing to listen and to be there and be willing to make adjustments.

And he spoke of his style of observation:

> I show up whenever I want to. I walk in at whatever part of the lesson. I sit down and I take what's called a "modified verbatim." I was trained in Madeline Hunter [Instructional Theory into Practice or ITIP, i.e.] . . . . I get key words and key phrases and key sentences down and key trigger-ideas that are those things that I'm thinking of talking about . . . . at the beginning of the lesson it's kind of like listening. . . . I have to get into the teacher so by just getting their words down ---no matter what they're saying, the kids are saying--- the first four or five minutes; all of that and not even making any judgment on that. That gets me loosened up to the class. It gets me really watching and focusing.

Vern talked more about his role:

> Those are things that I'm paid to bring up, ethically and morally. I think that anything having an influence upon that person in the classroom should be brought up.

> Now, you have to approach some of those things appropriately.

When speaking of the teacher's need to fit the culture of the local school population, Vern asked:

> How much do we make them adapt and how much do we adapt? It's a real "catch-22." Because if they don't adapt --- even if there are a few of us around to believe in them--- if they can't adapt enough, all those people here who pay the taxes to keep the school open, we don't have control over <u>their</u> adaptability, you know. And they're the ones who, in the long run, could sink the ship, so to speak.

Helen, another of the program's supervisors, was quite articulate in listing the responsibilities of a supervisor --- as she saw them:

> . . . and then the third thing is to have that knowledge of self and vision . . . and being able to help these "kids" have a philosophy, a vision, and to translate that into classroom practice . . . . You want them to teach one another; to be actively involved; to be reflective, problem-solve. And that our responsibility . . . is to provide guidance. Not that we <u>do</u> the work for them, but that we provide guidance and help them. And so we, as you know, referred to them as "our babies." We call 'em "our babies." And what that means, basically, is that they are newborn entities and it's not <u>total</u> parenting but it is a whole aspect of parenting to these kids.

And, in reflecting upon her concerns for a new supervisor, Helen said:

> Because she's had student teachers and graduate teaching assistants she might want to do too much for them rather than let them experience failure, which is very important. And I like her willingness to help and go in and do things but she has to remember that these are individuals in charge of their classroom and that they are responsible. She is not to be the responsible person for them.

Kendra, the fourth supervisor, spoke of her role in helping her interns to "keep a balance":

> . . . helping them keep a balance; because I've learned with my years in life how very, very important that is

> and how it destroys my teaching if I don't keep a balance in my life. And I see them tipping the scales way, way off ---to the point of focusing everything on the school, kids, problems, curriculum, report cards; and neglecting themselves and any significant people in their lives.

"Allowing them to fail" was a phrase Kendra used in speaking of the process of encouraging change in these adult learners:

> . . . so they internalize it. It takes time. It has to be important to them. They have to see its value to them, personally, as a teacher. It has to fit into their value system, their philosophy. And there has to be an adult learner [the supervisor] that's strong enough to allow them to fail as they change.
>
> And the bottom-line in being a [supervisor] with these full-time professional teachers is: they will do what they choose to do because they are <u>not</u> student teachers. And, yes, you can give them assignments and you can make requirements but when you leave the room they will teach the way they want and they will write lesson plans the way they want to. So I help them figure out what is really effective for them. Because they want to be good teachers they're usually receptive to those kinds of ideas.

Kendra talked of her interns' growth:

> . . . in other words, as they gain in expertise and knowledge and skill I find myself deferring to them and realizing that they have suddenly acquired some knowledge and skills and things that I don't know or that are extensions of things I know. Not that they didn't know things that I didn't know at the beginning but they become better teachers and I don't feel the need to point as many things out to them as I might have originally.

She spoke of the changes she made in her role in response to the yearly cycle of growth by her interns:

> I mean I'm obviously winding down this time of the year ---taking as much pressure off of them as I possibly can. What they're going to change, they've changed already or they're not going to change it this year.

At another time, Kendra spoke of the uselessness of negative feedback and criticism in getting adult learners to grow or change:

> Well, I think one of the reasons is that research doesn't indicate that anybody's going to change with those kinds of comments being given to them. They will not make critical change. They might change for their supervisor, "because my supervisor said it was the shits." But once they're on their own without a supervisor, they're going right back ---it isn't internalized. It isn't valued by them. Somehow, I think we all try to make it, to phrase it or to give them data or to overwhelm them with the idea that, "hey, this really wasn't very good and for the sake of the kids, [you] can do better. [You] need to do better."
>
> You give the person no room to move [with criticism]. You attack not just their teaching but them as people, as individuals, as professionals. You're hitting all the buttons when you come on like that, I think.

She also talked about the ambiguous nature of teaching and the incertitude of those interventions she might suggest: "Nobody has any absolute answers."

Both the literature and the "field" are ripe with evidence that, anthropologically speaking, one role supervisors perform ---and acknowledge that they perform--- is that of guiding the nascent teacher into the cultures of teaching and their realizations in their particular school.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR

What characteristics do university supervisors possess which make them ideal candidates for the role of guide in orienting their charges to this culture?

The assumption is that socialization is an interactive process, a two-way street (Wentworth, 1980), and that each actor affects the others. Zeichner and Tabachnick (1985), following Lacey (1977), identify three strategies the novice teacher may

employ in meeting the situational demands placed upon them: internalized adjustment, strategic compliance, and strategic redefinition (pp. 9-10). In describing the complexity of the socialization process of student teachers and that of its study, they state:

> . . . the induction of beginning teachers is highly context specific, related in each instance to unique interactions of persons (who possess varying levels of skills and capabilities) and school contexts (which differ in the constraints and opportunities for action they present to beginning teachers), it becomes necessary to study how specific beginning teachers are inducted into particular school contexts before attempting to formulate generalizations about the process of entry into the teaching role (p.4).

For one to fulfill the role of guide, there also needs to be a "follower," a student. Students or novice teachers have a say in who they will follow and who they will believe (though not necessarily in who is assigned them). Perhaps it's no more than supposition, but it would seem beginning teachers would develop an affinity for those who supported them in turn; those who were perceived to share some characteristics with the student or beginning teacher; and, quite possibly, those who seem to accurately interpret the world of the student and explicate the complexities of classrooms and schools. This is the meaning-making function of the guide and it manifests itself in the relation between the two people. It manifests itself in what the supervisor sees and says, in the language used in the conferences and that which is communicated nonverbally.

University supervisors[7] generally have been teachers ---and often not too long ago. As teachers, most of these supervisors

became enculturated into both the general teacher culture (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986) and into some local variety. It may be advantageous for the student if the supervisor has been a member in good standing in the district of the student's current placement or, if not, to have had experience and be recognized there. As Migra (1976) pointed out, it wasn't just the student teacher who was oriented to the university supervisor as a mediator or facilitator; cooperating teachers and principals did so, too.

Figuratively speaking, the university supervisor has a foot in each of the worlds of the student teacher: the school and the university.[8] The university supervisor is familiar with the student teachers' courses and professors. The supervisor can facilitate communication between university and classroom. In fact, I would argue that the usefulness of the supervisor as a guide depends, in part, on how successfully they are able to negotiate local teacher culture ---where they are accepted as members by the cooperating teacher; the principal; and the secretary.[9]

In the case of the supervisors quoted above, there have been selection processes operating for them to come to be in the positions they hold.[10] It could be argued that these supervisors, with their district appointments (one works in personnel), are committed to recruiting select interns for their district.[11] This may include acting to socialize the beginning teacher to both district and school norms.

Herein lies an important difference between the supervisor of interns and the supervisor of student teachers: the district ---through its agent, the supervisor--- is making an investment (by paying the supervisor's salary, etc.) in the intern teacher and demonstrating a high level of commitment; the university and its agent ---usually a graduate student with no particular district affiliation at the time--- doesn't make a like committment.[12]

ETHNOGRAPHY OF SUPERVISION

I wish to join my voice to those of Pajak and Glickman (1989) in calling for a full-blown ethnography of supervision. Such an ethnography would reveal how supervisors go about doing what it is they do; and would make explicit the meanings or understandings supervisors bring to their work.

What might an ethnography of supervision reveal?[13] As noted, supervisors generally have undergone enculturation as teachers (see Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986) and may have evolved or been socialized beyond that into "supervisor culture." The assumptions of teachers within North American society have become part of the supervisor's baggage.

SUPERVISOR CULTURE

All participants in supervision hold some notion of what a supervisor is and does. These notions and their activation on the scene help to create a "supervisor culture" that is both

similar and dissimilar to teacher culture. The characteristics of any supervisor include a degree of adherence to the norms of supervisor culture.

What does "supervisor culture" contribute to the way supervisors think and operate? And ---a related question--- how can these norms, beliefs and behaviors be best brought to the level of awareness for either the supervisor or the student of supervision?

Like teachers, supervisors believe in individualization of instruction: quite common are the discussions of supervisors' desires to adapt to the needs and style of a new teacher. An idea which is related to individualization is that of "autonomy"[14] ---which, in turn, is related to the concept of "professionalism." Migra (quoted above) has shown how supervisors orient to the student teacher as a professional ---a message often at odds with those received from cooperating teachers (or university professors). The supervisor's orientation towards the student teacher as a professional sets her or him apart from others with whom the budding teacher comes into contact.[15] The norms, the philosophy of many supervision models reinforce this.

Coupled with the definition of the student teacher as professional are the norms which dictate how a supervisor is to interact with such a professional. Chief among these norms is that of non-interruption: the supervisor is aware of the statement they would be making if they were to interrupt a

student (or intern) teacher's lesson and proceed to say or model "this is how it should be done." Supervisors point to this strategy's negative effect upon both the student teacher and their pupils.[16]

Another norm of interaction between professionals influences the structure and content of feedback conferences: There is preference for supervisors to avoid directives, "do this," (again, Pajak and Glickman, 1989) in guiding the student teacher to become "reflective." This may be a carry-over from the "reflective practitioner" valued so highly in teacher culture.

Conferences take on interesting dimensions when viewed cross-culturally: In cultures such as the Athapaskan of Alberta, Canada (Scollon and Scollon, 1981) those who possess wisdom or knowledge are in the position of demonstrating or displaying that knowledge while the novice listens, watches and learns. The opposite is the case in North American society, generally, and in teaching, more specifically (Mehan, 1979).

In supervision, it is the novice who displays and not the knowledgeable supervisor: The supervisor arrives upon the scene and conferences with the student teacher about the upcoming lesson (or may simply assume a seat in the back of the room, depending upon the time available and the model of supervision in use). This is done to check that the student teacher has "all the bases covered," but it also serves to orient the supervisor to the teacher's style and assumptions. The supervisor may

choose to ask questions or make suggestions at this point in an attempt to lessen the possibility that something will go wrong ---a protective role the supervisor assumes--- or in an effort to assure the student teacher's fidelity to the view the university (or the supervisor, personally) has of teaching.

The student teacher then may be asked to display again in answering the supervisor's question about which "problem" or area the teacher would like feedback on or even which observational instrument would be most useful (this decision is often left to the supervisor). It should be noted that in managing these supervisory decisions, the supervisor and the student teacher act out their assumptions concerning the nature of supervision and the relationship between the participants (e.g., power-solidarity issues).

The student teacher displays yet again in performing the teaching act, while the supervisor gathers whatever was agreed upon or what seems most relevant or problematic. (In making these decisions, the supervisor acts out cultural assumptions concerning such things as the nature of teaching, the role of the teacher in interacting with students, what is permissible or desirable in "managing" younger people, where this adult should be positioned in relation to the pupils . . . .)

In the "post-conference" (i.e., the conference held after the teaching act), the student teacher is asked to display again in "de-briefing" the lesson. At my institution, students "know the drill": "What went well?"; "What you would you do

differently?" These questions, as well as the conference itself, may take on ritualistic overtones.

An ethnography of supervision may reveal that supervisors' warrants for what they do include: a) concern for the student teacher, b) concern for the students in the classroom, c) the supervisor's or university's philosophical orientation, and d) perceived time pressures ---both in the observation and conference and in the length of the relationship. Indeed, concern for the students in the classroom has been cited as "the bottom line" and used as a warrant for violating the norms of supervisor-teacher interaction, e.g., interrupting the lesson. The time factor is often used as a warrant for violating the norms centered around professionalism when the supervisor feels a need to be direct.

An ethnography of supervision could benefit from an application of Hall's (1959) three levels of culture ---the formal, the informal and the technical--- in examining supervisor culture. Generally, the technical culture of teaching is the supervisor's domain. This would include the (cultural) aspects of teaching behavior such as "time on task," method, strategy, planning, pacing of the lesson, questioning, and the teacher's efforts to assess the student learning which resulted from the lesson. When the supervisor deviates from the technical and enters the informal or formal aspects of culture, an ethnography of supervision may reveal cultural aspects of the nation, the community and the school which have an impact upon how teaching

is practiced and perceived. Hall wrote that these three levels of culture may operate simultaneously (p. 72).

IMPLICATIONS

If the general thrust of the ideas presented here is on target, then what are the implications for the education of supervisors?

Abrell and Hanna (1978) cautioned supervisors against dealing with teachers as simple individual manifestations of the collective teacher culture. They warned that a teacher may possess knowledge of teacher culture sufficient enough to allow them to look and act like a teacher and yet be deficient in the technical skills required for the job.[17] The same possibility exists for supervisors themselves: Granting the existence of a separate "supervisor culture"; one may have cultural knowledge of the formal and informal sufficient to act the part of a supervisor without possessing technical expertise. I imagine there are those in the position of supervisor who possess little or no expertise in any of the three levels of culture. It may be that the supervisor who operates more within the informal or formal may prove of more service to the beginning teacher than the more technically oriented supervisor.[18]

I would argue that more educators should become practitioners of the ethnographic study of their environment ---which may aid in self-study also.[19] Ethnographic training is essential to seeing beyond the simply technical level of teacher

and school culture. Often, the instruments commonly in use for classroom observation are inadequate to reveal what is really going on in classrooms.

A supervisor who was trained in ethnography would be more apt to see the underlying cultural assumptions and resultant behaviors operating in a classroom or school. This ability to perceive cultural aspects of schooling may be accomplished simply through making greater use of the lessons from anthropology. I am not suggesting that ethnography is the only way to expand supervisors' awareness. But I do believe I have shown how cultural aspects of thought and behavior deeply affect supervision. Nor has it been my intention to value a certain cultural knowledge over another. I believe all these aspects of supervision are important. I believe that they all should be openly acknowledged and valued.

1.I wish to acknowledge the assistance given me by Harry Wolcott and Keith Acheson in the development of my ideas and style.

2.Weller attributes this definition to Lucio and McNeil (1959:26). He also wrote: "Instructional supervision is a poorly defined and inadequately conceptualized process (1971:4)."

3.The concept of culture employed in this paper is that of a unified system of meaning peoples ascribe to their lives, both personal and professional. It should be noted that "culture" is an heuristic employed by anthropologists and seldom contemplated or made explicit by the members themselves, hence, its taken-for-granted nature. There is a definite distinction between so-called "school culture" and "school climate." For a comprehensive discussion of "the cultures of teaching" see the work of that name by Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986).

4.Meanings and understandings are essential characteristics of culture.

5.In fact, Alfonso argues that supervisors ought to take a more active role in socializing new teachers: "The process through which new teachers are socialized is an area in which supervisors could have some influence, but in fact have very little. . . ." (p. 23.). I argue that they already do as much, but then I speak of the university supervisor.

6.Presumably Migra herself. Recently there have been a number of treatments of student teaching from an anthropological perspective (Head, 1989; White, 1989).

7.Those supervisors quoted above would qualify because of their university affiliation ---to which some status is often attached by other district staff.

8.Differences exist between programs as to the frequency and duration of supervisor-teacher contact, the supervision models, and university teacher education curriculum.

9.In this regard the intern teacher supervisor has a distinct advantage over the university supervisor. In my experience, unknown supervisors often need to establish their credentials for the cooperating teacher in the early fact-to-face encounters.

10.Sometimes a certain mentor is mentioned, sometimes university coursework, or extensive district training through workshops, etc. Also, because of the position they now hold, these supervisors have moved on to become something that is not quite a teacher.

11.I do not mean to suggest the recruitment process is simple: other factors are operating such as the intern's decision, the principal's, the community's, and district budget considerations. It is the building principal who makes the original hiring decision in this program's placements.

12.Doubtless, university professors often supervise student teachers and there may be other district/university collaborations not addressed in this paper. And it should be mentioned that some of these teachers-cum-graduate-students are planning to return to the classroom and some plan not to.

13.I base my observations on reflection aided by an anthropological perspective. My experience with both university supervisors, intern teacher supervisors and my personal experience in both roles is seen as an aid in the interpretation of these roles. It may, at times, serve as a blinder.

14."Autonomy," as it is used in this context, is an elusive quality. Kilbourn (1982:2) argues that the "spirit of clinical supervision" lies in autonomy, evidence and continuity. Yet how is it that one can be said to be autonomous when interacting with

thirty vibrant human beings at one time? (cf. Lortie, 1975:100,146-151).

15.A student teacher may not become a bona fide member of teacher culture in the eyes of members until she or he has gained at least one year's experience, often more. During an intern's first year the metamorphosis is apparent soon after December. Supervisors may orient to the student teacher as a "teacher" even earlier than the student her/himself.

16.Blase (1986) depicts the role pupils play in the socialization of new teachers. Supervisors may realize this and seek to avoid any negative fallout resulting from their actions.

17.It could be argued (as it has been by Wolcott [classnotes, 1989]) that teachers would be more successful in their jobs and be more highly perceived by colleagues if they are well-versed in the informal rather than formal or technical aspects of teacher culture; a finding seemingly supported by Zeichner and Tabachnick (1985:16) in their reporting of first-year teachers being able to ignore bureaucratic rules.

18.Word is not mentioned of the children's benefit.

19.With this I join a long line of others (Hymes, 1980; Kilbourn, 1984; Proudfoot, personal communication). I'm not sure I would argue that all teachers receive the rigorous training nor attack fieldwork with quite as much vigor as anthropologists have been known to do ---though I certainly would not want to see the opportunity denied them. And with the schools filled with ethnographers, who's going to teach? and what? The problem of "nearsightedness" may yet remain, and people may still be prone to not see or else deny what was happening (Henry,1972). Actually, dyed-in-the-wool ethnographers probably wouldn't suit the needs of teachers who are known for wanting immediate feedback. Is "another set of eyes" the only viable answer then?

REFERENCES CITED

Abrell, R. and Hanna, C. 1978. Symbolic interactionism and supervisor-teacher relationships. Clearing House, vol. 51 (9): 439-43.

Acheson, K. and Gall, M. 1987. Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers: Preservice and Inservice Applications, second edition. New York: Longman.

Alfonso, R. 1986. The unseen supervisor: organization and culture as determinants of teacher behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Blase, J. 1986. Socialization as humanization: one side of becoming a teacher. Sociology of Education, vol. 59(2): 100-13.

Feiman-Nemser, S. and Floden, R. 1986. The cultures of teaching. in Handbook of Research on Teaching, Third Edition, M. Wittrock (ed.), New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Hall, E. 1959. The Silent Language. Greenwich, CT: Fawcett Publications, Inc.

Head, F. 1989. Student Teaching: The Liminal Phase of an Educational Rite of Passage? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.

Henry, J. 1972. On Education. New York: Vintage Books.

Hymes, D. 1980. Language in Education: Ethnolinguistic Essays. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Kilbourn, B. 1982. Linda: A Case Study in Clinical Supervision. Canadian Journal of Education, vol. 7(3):1-24.

Kilbourn, B. 1984. Ethnographic research and the improvement of teaching. in Seeing Curriculum in a New Light: Essays form Science Education, H. Munby, G. Orpwood and T. Russell (eds.). New York: University Press of America. [originally published 1980, Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education]

Lacey, C. 1977. The Socialization of Teachers. London: Methuen.

Lortie, D. 1975. Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lucio, W. and McNeil, J. 1959. Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mehan, H. 1979. Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Migra, E. 1976. The Transition from Theory into Practice: A Microethnography of Student Teaching as a Cultural Experience. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University.

Pajak, E. and Glickman, C. 1989. Informational and controlling language in simulated supervisory conferences, American Educational Research Journal, vol. 26(1): 93-106.

Scollon, R. and Scollon, S. 1981. Narrative, Literacy and Face in Interethnic Communication. Norwood, N.J.:Ablex.

Sergiovanni, T. 1985. Landscapes, mindscapes, and reflective practice in supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, vol. 1(1): 5-17.

Tabachnick, B., Popkewitz, T., and Zeichner, K. 1979-80. Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. Interchange, vol. 10:12-29

Weller, R. 1971. Verbal Communication in Instructional Supervision: An Observational System for and Research Study of Clinical Supervision in Groups. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wentworth, W. 1980. Context and Understanding: An Inquiry into Socialization Theory. New York: Elsevier.

White, J. 1989. Student teaching as a rite of passage. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, vol. 20(3):177-195.

Zeichner, K., Liston, D., Mahlios, M., and Gomez, M. The structure and goals of a student teaching program and the character and quality of supervisory discourse. Teaching & Teacher Education, vol. 4(4): 349-62.

Zeichner, K. and Tabachnick, B. 1981. Are the effects of university teacher education "washed out" by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 32(3): 7-11.

-------- 1985. The development of teacher perspectives: social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, vol. 11(1): 1-25.